The parties have submitted a Stipulation and Protective Order for the court's endorsement. Portions of the proposed order are problematic – specifically, the language following "Central Personnel Index" in the first numbered paragraph and all but the first sentence of the second numbered paragraph – because they contemplate that counsel may designate materials as confidential, and therefore subject to the order, without a showing of "good cause" as required by Rule 26(c). Accordingly, the court has declined to enter the order as written. Instead, the court has entered a modified version of the Stipulation and Protective Order which deletes the above described language and makes certain other minor modifications to the two affected paragraphs. To the extent that a party wishes to enlarge the scope of the Protective Order to include other documents or information, an application may be made to the court which describes the additional documents or other information with sufficient specificity to permit the court to determine whether they qualify for protection, and if the need for protection is not readily apparent from a description of the documents, a showing of good cause must accompany the application.

SO ORDERED:

VIKTOR V. POHORELSKY United States Magistrate Judge

Viktor V. Pohorelsky

Dated: Brooklyn, New York October 21, 2008